

naught in consequence. And it is true we did have a large and respectable minority of brethren who, when the division had come and we Progressives were obliged to go it alone, believed honestly and sincerely that we should not organize the churches into conferences of any kind. They particularly dreaded a General Conference, and to have told them at that time that we were going to have an Annual Conference would have driven them away from us entirely. They wanted a congregational form of government, they told us, and they evidently meant by that that each congregation should be independent from each other congregation in everything; they were not willing to recognize any inter-congregational relationship and were not willing to help make any arrangement by which the congregations might co-operate together in any good work. They practically insisted that every congregation was a church within itself, by itself, and for itself. They ignored the example of the apostolic church and the teachings of Paul in his various epistles where it is clearly shown that the congregations, also called churches, co-operated together to accomplish benevolent and missionary purposes.

It seems strange to us at this date that so many good brethren held to this view, but there was a reason for it, and it seems to me that a spirit of fairness demands that I here give the reason they had for holding such views. Their views were erroneous as they now themselves admit, but at that time they had much apparent reason for their opposition to church conferences.

They had before them an object lesson of what the abuse of church conferences had accomplished in evil, and what they had failed to accomplish of good.

When we explained to them that district and general conferences were necessary to promote missionary work, they answered: "Where did the Annual Meeting" (alluding to the German Baptist Brethren A. M. as it then was) "where did the Annual Meeting ever promote missionary work?" Individual members and churches time and again called the attention of the A. M. to the importance of carrying out the great commission, only to be set back, their well formulated plans rejected, and no others offered by Annual Meeting itself to take their place. When we told them we needed the co-operation of all the churches to establish educational institutions, they answered us correctly that all the educational institutions that had been established by the "old church" so far had been organized as individual enterprises and instead of being fostered by Annual Conference existed in spite of its antagonistic decision.

Art. 10 of Annual Meeting of 1874 reads as follows: "Inasmuch as the Brethren when assembled in Annual Council in the year 1831 decided it not to be advisable for a brother to have his son educated in a college 'inasmuch' they say as experience has taught us that such seldom will come back to the

humble ways of the Lord, what will the District Meeting and our Annual Meeting say when a combination of brethren are trying to get up a high school for the more thorough education of the brethren's children and term it the Brethren's school? Answer. Referred to the minutes of A. M. of 1858 Art. 51. But the brethren shall not call the school the Brethren's school or any other name involving the general brotherhood."

When we insisted that district and general conferences were necessary to promote love and unity among the brethren they pointed to the bickerings and quarrelings of Annual Meeting and the three divisions of the church, the old order, the conservative and progressives.

When all evil and the little good the annual meetings of said church had done during those years prior to the division was considered, there was not much wonder that there was a strong anti conference sentiment in the newly reorganized church.

But for all this the Brethren made the new start with the idea dominant that an organization of the congregations was both scriptural and expedient, and provisions were made in the early mass meetings after the division for such organization.

But we progressives had to move along very conservatively and diplomatically. We did talk about district meetings but we were careful not to say annual meetings or annual conferences. We would call a general conference when we thought we needed one, and that satisfied the radical congregationalists because they thought we surely would never need it, they had no use for it. They would, might, or could tolerate district conferences and a general conference once in a long while but annual conferences, never!

When the Dayton convention was held in 1887 about the best we could do to conserve the good will and harmony of all the brethren, was to resolve, that national conventions shall be held once every five years unless a majority of the State Conference would request that an intermediate convention should be called. There was no call from the districts for a convention before the expiration of the five years, and the next convention after the Dayton convention was called to meet at Warsaw, Indiana, August 23 27, 1892. It was during this interval of five years, that the prophets of evil said we were in a state of anarchy, that we had no church government and that we were doomed to ecclesiastical shipwreck.

We had our meeting at Warsaw and it passed off so well, and with such general satisfaction, that instead of waiting five years for another general conference we were able to pass the following: Art. 8. The sessions of the National conference shall hereafter be held biennially unless it will have designated at its last meeting how soon the next meeting should be held." And then follows this: Your committee respectfully recommend * * that we hold our next conference in 1893. And we have had our general conference annually ever since.

Many are now attending conference, and have become enthusiasts in the work who would not attend at first. And we hear only praise for the work done and no fault found. I think I can safely say that we are at last established on a permanent basis. We have shown what these conferences can do and what are their legitimate uses. That they do not hinder the gospel, that they do promote the welfare of the church in every good work.

By their fruit ye shall know them. We direct your attention to our foreign and home missionary work; to the work of the Sisters' Society; Ashland University; a Brethren Publishing house owned and controlled by the church; Sunday school literature of our own; tracts and books.

Instead of having our churches about all in the rural districts and named after the creeks and valleys, we now have churches in the cities; Philadelphia, Washington City, Hagerstown, Johnstown, Pittsburg, Warsaw, Waterloo, Chicago, Falls City, etc., etc. And none of our conferences have yet attempted to interfere with our personal liberties as to how we should comb our hair or shape our garments; whether men might wear suspenders, or women might wear for a head dress aught but hoods or bonnets.

Now I have told you at some length, and in part why we have a Kanemorado district. It is because that element in the church which believed in church organization prevailed and triumphed.

We have a Kanemorado district, so named because in 1892 a committee was appointed consisting of E. L. Yoder of Kansas, John Lichty and Mrs. Nina Lichty of Nebraska to frame an appropriate name for the district which was then composed of the states of Kansas, Nebraska, Missouri and Colorado. After considerable mental agony a new word was coined, the word Kanemorado was invented which is composed in part of each name of the states then in the district, *Ka* for Kansas, *ne* for Nebraska, *mo* for Missouri, and *rado* for Colorado.

Another reason why we have a Kanemorado district is that we are still not strong enough as a church, we think, to have the district divided.

The matter of dividing the district was brought up several years ago but was voted down as inexpedient and has not been agitated since. It is unfortunate that we are so few and far between. I think the time will come when the district will be divided and then the name will be lost.

I predict that when the district will be divided it will be in three divisions. One here in the West embracing Carleton, Beaver City, Norton, etc. etc. The other embracing Falls City, Hamlin, Morrill, and nearby churches, and the other, Kansas City, Lawrence, McLouth and other churches in that part of the district.

As we are now constituted we must necessarily make a poor showing at our conferences. Being scattered over three or four